

PRD STRATEGIC PLAN

Assessment of MSWC 2000-2005 Goals
(Results from meeting of 11/30/2006)

GOAL 1 - Upgrade and Maintain Existing Facilities *Through a careful process which begins with study and thorough inventory, the Commission will create a maintenance schedule and prioritize the upgrades of existing Harbor Facilities and Boating Access Sites. Specific benchmarks will include:*

- By year one, complete the harbor electrical study.
- By year two, complete the Boating Access Sites infrastructure study.
- By year three, complete the harbor infrastructure study.
- By year three, develop a preventive maintenance schedule for boating access sites.
- By year five, upgrade electrical infrastructure at 12-15 harbors (at the rate of 4-5 per year, with priority determined by the electrical study).
- By year five, upgrade a number of boating access sites.

1. What are the **Strengths** you can associate with this goal?

- Continue utility upgrades.
- Retain and attract new users.
- Framework exists.
- Loyal following.
- Preventative Maintenance.

2. What are the **Challenges** you associate with this goal?

- Determining appropriate capacity of electric/utilities today and future.
- Need for technology updates.
- Need for utility upgrades.
- Funding.
- We have to maintain what we have.
- Upgrades pressure nearby facilities to duplicate.
- Preventative maintenance.
- Economy up/down.
- Maintaining/sustaining internal expertise (boat crews).

3. What are the **Opportunities** to be realized with this goal?

- Determining trends and respond with facility(s).
- Market analysis.
- Maintaining high level of quality.
- Preventative maintenance.
- Economy ups/downs.

- Incorporate in harbor features new trends, or changing needs (pavilions, clubhouses, kayak rack).
- Internships.
- Partnerships.

4. What are the **Threats** you can associate with this goal?

- Fuel costs, economy.
- Regulatory changes, laws, rules.
- Expectations.
- Water levels (up and down).
- Invasive species... hydrills, milfoil, z-m. (all types)
- Training...ramp builders.
- Funding.

5. Is this still a valid goal?

- Yes.

6. Would you modify this goal? (How?)

- Include technology (what users desire).
- New construction trends, tools, materials.
- Alternatives. (e.g. 'Green' products and buildings).

7. Would you establish any other goals related to this topic? (What?)

- Establish annual goals with priorities.
- Combine IMA and MRBIS into electronic unit.
- Modify facilities to respond to new trends.
- Continue to improve universal accessibility.

GOAL 2 - Create New Boat Access Site Facilities *The Commission will increase the number of Boating Access Sites in areas of limited access by 5 to 10 sites to better serve the needs of recreational boaters. The Commission will pro-actively create partnerships and garner local support in creating these sites. The Commission's work will depend on:*

- *The identification of high priority areas for public access*
- *The establishment of a Boating Access Site Committee*
- *The consistent use of survey methods to test for and gain local support.*

1. What are the **Strengths** you can associate with this goal?

- Increase activity.
- Revenue available to construct sites.

- Awareness of boating.
- Other DNR opportunities.

2. What are the **Challenges** you associate with this goal?

- Process not known to the Commissioners.
- Land availability.
- Future demands and type of demands.
- No revenue from kayaks (or other non-registered watercraft)
- No sustainability of program.

3. What are the **Opportunities** to be realized with this goal?

- License vs. registration to gain more revenue.
- Navigable lakes and streams.
- Expand Grants-In-Aid program.
- Elevate boating potential where it currently does not exist.
- Register non-motorized craft.
- Stronger partnership between fishing and boating (also wildlife).
- Political support.
- Synergy of activities.
- Expand funding, i.e., federal grants.
- Create a Boating Foundation (similar to the Parks Foundation).
- John Dingell. (In strong political position for the next 18-24 months)
- Partnerships with historic/cultural interests (e.g. HAL, Foundations, etc.)

4. What are the **Threats** you can associate with this goal?

- Supporting current sites.
- Negative public reaction.
- Environmental impacts.

5. Is this still a valid goal?

- Yes.

6. Would you modify this goal? (How?)

- Develop a strong process to assess and support the development of new sites (all watercraft).

7. Would you establish any other goals related to this topic? (What?)

- Develop a strong process to assess and support the development of new sites (watercraft).

GOAL 3 - Create Harbors of Refuge *The Commission will complete the Cedar River project and seek an alternate design/site for a harbor of refuge at Cross Village. The Commission will also complete a needs study for harbors of refuge in Lake Superior. In all efforts, the Commission will work with the Army Corps of Engineers to identify navigational issues in site selection, and the Congressional delegation to seek federal funding to establish harbors.*

1. What are the **Strengths** you can associate with this goal?

- Complete the safety net.
- Increase navigation.

2. What are the **Challenges** you associate with this goal?

- Piping Plover and environmental issues.
- Availability of funds.
- General infrastructure expenses.
- Disposal sites (adequate).
- Permitting issues.
- Continue to validate program needs.
- Marketing.

3. What are the **Opportunities** to be realized with this goal?

- Marketing opportunity.
- Future trends and demands.
- Partnerships with private sector.

4. What are the **Threats** you can associate with this goal?

- Goal 2 and 3 are mirrored in many factors.

5. Is this still a valid goal?

- Yes.

6. Would you modify this goal? (How?)

- Yes, explore type of boat and market to serve.

7. Would you establish any other goals related to this topic? (What?)

GOAL 4 - Strengthen Internal Structure and Efficiency

- A) *The Commission will utilize "Standing Committees" to better manage the boater's needs in the State of Michigan. They will include:*
- *Facilities*
 - *Operation/Policy*
 - *Boating Access*
 - *Public/Governmental Relations*
 - *Finance*
- B) *The Standing Committees will work to bring outside constituency groups into the public process of the Commission.*
- C) *The Commission will direct staff to utilize the Bureau's Field Structure to assist in statewide compliance of regulations, project agreements, and policies pertaining to all Waterways Commission sponsored facilities.*

1. What are the **Strengths** you can associate with this goal?

- Standing Committees work issues out beforehand.
- Can address issues quickly with core subcommittee.
- Can map out opportunities to subcommittee tasks.
- Committees help organize boaters.

2. What are the **Challenges** you associate with this goal?

- Commissioner turnover.
- Information, meetings, sharing.
- Communities unhappy with audits.
- Staff training/scheduling/planning.
- Need to represent unorganized boating public.

3. What are the **Opportunities** to be realized with this goal?

- Can fully discuss an issue.

4. What are the **Threats** you can associate with this goal?

- Boaters not an organized group...MSWC can bring these constituents together.

5. Is this still a valid goal?

- Yes

6. Would you modify this goal? (How?)

- Yes, but look at subgroups differently (have added strategic plan too).
- Part C – using field structure – modify language to be current but keep basic goal.

7. Would you establish any other goals related to this topic? (What?)

- Knowledgeable/trained staff available for harbor/BAS public.
- Seek new methods for MSWC to reach out to boating public (comment cards, meeting announcements, meeting times, etc....).

DRAFT